

Amy Blalock
1001 Gayley Ave #24381
Los Angeles, CA 90024
amyblalock@gmail.com

In Pro Se

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In re:

AMY LYNNE BLALOCK, an individual;

Debtor,

STEWART LUCAS MURREY, an individual;

Plaintiff,

AMY LYNNE BLALOCK, an individual;

Debt

Adversary Case No. 24-AP-01152-BR

Bankruptcy Case No. 24-bk-12532-BR

Chapter: 7

**DEFENDANT AMY BLALOCK'S RESPONSE
TO PLAINTIFF DR. STEWART LUCAS
MURREY'S REPLY DECLARATION IN
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT MS. AMY
BLALOCK'S REPLY DECLARATION**

Hearing Date: March 25, 2025

Hearing Time: 10:00am

Courtroom: 1668

Judge: Honorable Barry Russell

**DEFENDANT AMY BLALOCK'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF DR. STEWART LUCAS
MURREY'S REPLY DECLARATION IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT MS. AMY
BLALOCK'S REPLY DECLARATION**

I, Amy Blalock, declare as follows:

1. I am the Defendant in this matter. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this declaration and, if called as a witness, could and would testify competently thereto.

2. This Response is in response to Plaintiff Dr. Stewart Lucas Murrey's Reply Declaration in Opposition to Defendant Ms. Amy Blalock's Reply Declaration.
3. **Object.** I have clearly stated that anything I've said about the Plaintiff is only an expression of my opinions, interactions or fears of the Plaintiff.
4. **Object.** I have clearly stated that anything I've said about the Plaintiff is only an expression of my opinions, interactions or fears of the Plaintiff.
5. **Exhibit 1** of the Plaintiff's declaration only shows the Facegroup groups that exist. While I used to be a member of the 'Are We Dating the Same Guy? Los Angeles Group', a group that exists to protect women, *I only ever expressed my opinions, interactions, or fears within the group and only ever represented myself, not an anonymous person.*
6. **Object.** I never sought out to harass nor harm the Plaintiff with my comments in the 'AWDTSG?' Facebook Group. I only provided insight to my personal experience, personal opinions and personal fears about the Plaintiff.
7. **Object.** I commented "I'm afraid if there's any missing women in LA - he has something to do with it" Not as a fact, but as stated, "I'm afraid..." as a fear. The Plaintiff is alleging in his declaration by the statement I made that I am 'aggressively' portraying him as a 'serial killer' which I find to be a disturbing and frightful thought process and statement about me. Furthering my fears. I would not inform the Plaintiff as I did not have a way to contact him, nor would I given the fact that I am afraid of the Plaintiff. I never sought to harm the Plaintiff and was not a part of any cyber-attack or conspiracy against the Plaintiff.
8. **Object. I, the defendant, never said that the Plaintiff sought to murder women.** Plaintiff claims that by my comment "never go to the second location!" was me stating that he seeks to murder women. I never made any comment that wasn't my own opinion. I never sought to maliciously harm the Plaintiff in any way whatsoever.

- 1 9. **Object.** My statement about him ending up on Dateline is my opinion, not a fact.
- 2 10. **Object.** In this adversary case, the Plaintiff is claiming my statements online are what are
3 harmful to him, my statement online was merely an account of my personal experience, albeit
4 not truthful in the way the Plaintiff described.
- 5 11. **Object.** I'm not aware of any documentaries being done about Plaintiff, nor have I participated
6 in any media interviews. Further, the small sum I received from the GoFundMe was for legal
7 fees only AFTER the Plaintiff sued me.
- 8 12. **Object. Irrelevant to me the defendant and this case.** I don't know the Plaintiff's involvement
9 with Ms. Elly Shariat or interactions with her.
- 10 13. **Object.** I never sought injury or malice to the Plaintiff, nor did I profit off the alleged harm. I
11 only ever provided my experiences, opinions or fears of the Plaintiff which he has not proven.
- 12 14. **Object.** I never sought injury or malice to the Plaintiff, nor did I profit off the alleged harm. I
13 only ever provided my experiences, opinions or fears of the Plaintiff which he has not proven.
- 14 15. **Object.** I never sought injury or malice to the Plaintiff, nor did I profit off the alleged harm. I
15 only ever provided my experiences, opinions or fears of the Plaintiff which he has not proven.
- 16 16. **Object.** Everything I've said online is my personal experience, opinions or fears of the
17 Plaintiff.
- 18 17. **Object.** Everything I've said online are my personal experience, opinions and fears of the
19 Plaintiff. I've never lied and have not perjured myself whatsoever.
- 20 18. **Object.** I never said someone fraudulently signed my name. I said that someone started the
21 GoFundMe on behalf of some of the girls for legal funding AFTER the Plaintiff sued me. The
undersigned was for legal defense funding, not saying we were approving everyone's
experiences that were shown under the undersigned. And until the Plaintiff showed I had
Facebook points, I had no idea what they were. I still don't know how those are used and am

1 not aware that there's any monetary or other benefit from them.

2 19. **Object.** Everything I've said online are my personal experience, opinions and fears of the
3 Plaintiff.

4 20. **Object.** Everything I've said online are my personal experience, opinions and fears of the
5 Plaintiff. I was never in a co-conspiracy with anyone to harm the Plaintiff.

6 21. **Object.** This is the first time in either the state case or this lawsuit the Plaintiff said he tried to
7 serve me before December 17th, when he improperly served me at my apartment by leaving a
8 stack of papers at my doorstep himself. At the time, I thought it was a mistake until I realized it
9 was service papers. Having never been served before, I looked up the case online in December
10 and found out it was legitimately a case.

11 22. **Object.** I have not committed fraud, lied to the court nor did I profit from alleged harm of the
12 Plaintiff.

13 23. **Object.** Everything I've said online are my personal experience, opinions and fears of the
14 Plaintiff.

15 24. **Object.** My statements on *one* post and subsequent thread in the 'AWDTSG Group' were of
16 personal experience, opinion and fears of Plaintiff. I was not involved in the allegedly decades
17 long elaborate cyber-attack against Plaintiff, nor was I in any co-conspiracy.

18 25. **Object.** My statements on *one* post and subsequent thread in the 'AWDTSG Group' were of
19 personal experience, opinion and fears of Plaintiff. I was not involved in the allegedly decades
20 long elaborate cyber-attack against Plaintiff, nor was I in any co-conspiracy. If the Plaintiff
21 has sought work opportunities and been denied these opportunities, he would have been able to
prove that with objection letters from companies, which he has failed to provide. He has also
failed to provide any other evidence showing how he's been monetarily or otherwise harmed.

26. **Object.** I've never been involved in any media campaign and have given any interviews, or

1 otherwise and the Plaintiff has not shown me in any of his Exhibits, only the other women he's
2 sued.

3 27. **Object.** I have only ever spoken to my personal experiences, opinions or fears of the Plaintiff.

4 28. **Object.** I, the defendant, have never profited off any statement I've made about the Plaintiff,
5 nor have I sought to profit off the Plaintiff. My only involvement was a GoFundMe someone
6 else started to raise legal funds for the women the Plaintiff was suing, **after** the Plaintiff sued
us for defamation.

7 29. **Object.** The Plaintiff putting me in a new state lawsuit over similar defamation reasons should
8 be looked further into by this court.

9 30. **Object.** The Plaintiff putting me in a new state lawsuit over similar defamation reasons should
10 be looked further into by this court.

11 31. **Object.** I was never involved in any media campaigns.

12 32. **Object.** The Plaintiff putting me in a new state lawsuit over similar defamation reasons should
be looked further into by this court.

13 33. **Object.** I've never had any malicious intent towards the Plaintiff, or anyone else in a secret
14 conspiracy to harm the Plaintiff or anyone else otherwise.


15 In summary, I, Amy Blalock; the defendant, have not intentionally harmed the Plaintiff, I have not
16 monetized from my comments about the Plaintiff, I have not been in any conspiracy to harm the
17 Plaintiff nor has the Plaintiff been able to provide evidence of such. The Plaintiff has also not provided
18 any evidence that my comments have severely harmed his life or his ability to earn a living. In my
19 personal opinion and research, the Plaintiff abuses the legal system to bully, harass and extort money
20 from his victims through long legal battles that are unsubstantial. This adversary case against me,
21 being one of them and the new state lawsuit against me in the State of California, **case #**

1 **25STCV02792** for 1. Strict Product Liability; 2. Negligence; 3. Violation of Bus. and Prof; 4. Violation
2 of the California Consumer Legal Remedies Act; 5. Defamation - libel; 6. Defamation - libel per se; 7.
3 Defamation - per quod; 8. False light; 9. Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress; 10.
4 Misappropriation of Name and Likeness; 11. Civil Harrassment; 12. Unjust Enrichment; 13.
5 Sex-Based Discrimination in Violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act; 14. Gender Violation; 15.
6 Cyber-bullying; 16. Conspiracy to Weaponize and profit from Defective Products to Harm Plaintiff's
7 Reputation, Right to Free Speech, Sexual Identity and to Distress and Cyberbull Plaintiff (**See Exhibit**
8 **2** showing the new complaint in the State of California). This new complaint further shows how
9 diabolical the Plaintiff is in wasting the court resources. I find this to be a gross waste of our judicial
10 system and I know the Honorable Judge Barry Russell will see that the Plaintiff's action to continue
11 to sue me, again, in the State Court represents how the Plaintiff is being malicious towards me in
12 another baseless lawsuit. Since the plaintiff is going after me for defamation, false light and libel
13 *again.*

14 The Plaintiff's action to sue me again in state court, further supports my opinions and fears of the
15 Plaintiff that I commented online from personal experience. I request the court dismiss this case with
16 prejudice, in its entirety, due to the inability of the Plaintiff to provide evidence of malicious intent or
17 harm done to the Plaintiff by my online comments.

18 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true
19 and correct.

20 Executed on March 10, 2025, in Los Angeles, CA



AMY BLALOCK, DEFENDANT

IN PRO SE

EXHIBIT 2

Dr. Stewart Lucas Murrey
1217 Wilshire Blvd. # 3655
Santa Monica, CA 90403
Tel.: (424) 278-3017
Email: 2@lucasmurrey.io
Website: lucasmurrey.com
SocialMedia: sickoscoop.com/lucas
Plaintiff & Plaintiff In Pro Per

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
2/03/2025 12:00 AM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By Y. Tarasyuk, Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

STANLEY MOSK COURTHOUSE

DR. STEWART LUCAS MURREY, an
individual;

Plaintiff,

v.

Facebook, Inc. ("Facebook"), a publicly traded
company; "Are We Dating The Same Guy"
("AWDTSG"), a Facebook group with hundreds
of iterations world-wide; Paola Sanchez, an
individual; Anonymous Creators, Administrators
and/or Moderators of AWDTSG; Anonymous
Facebook account; The Daily Mail, a newspaper
company based in the United Kingdom;
Associated Newspaper LTD, a private limited
company based in the United Kingdom; Peter
Sheridan, an individual; Daniel Bates, an
individual; Taryn Pedler, an individual; Arthur
Parashar, an individual; Raven Saunt, an
individual; Katherine Poer-Anthony, an
individual; Anonymous organizer; Kelly
Gibbons, an individual; Elly Shariat, an
individual; Lena Vanderford, an individual; Amy
Blalock, an individual; Liv Burger, an individual;
Vanessa Valdes, an individual; Ainka Wiz, an
individual; Kelyn Rodriguez, an individual;
"Holden_Guardian_Co"; and DOES 1 through
50, inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No. **25STCV02792**

COMPLAINT FOR:

- 1) Strict Product Liability
- 2) Negligence
- 3) Violation of Bus. And Prof. § 17200
- 4) Violation of the California Consumer
Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. § 1750, et
seq.
- 5) Defamation – Libel
- 6) Defamation – Libel *per se*
- 7) Defamation – per quod
- 8) False Light
- 9) Intentional Infliction of Emotional
Distress
- 10) Misappropriation of Name and Likeness
- 11) Civil Harassment
- 12) Unjust Enrichment
- 13) Sex-Based Discrimination In Violation
Of The Unruh Civil Rights Act
(California Civil Code § 51)
- 14) Gender Violence In Violation Of
California Civil Code § 52.4
- 15) Cyberbullying
- 16) Conspiracy to Weaponize and Profit
From Defective Products to Harm
Plaintiff's Reputation, Right to Free
Speech, Sexual Identity; and to Distress
and Cyberbully Plaintiff
- 17) Declaratory Relief